



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,041	12/21/2001	Mary M. DaRif	6962	8619

7590 11/30/2004
The Sherwin-Williams Company
Legal Dept.
11 Midland Bldg.
101 Prospect Avenue, N.W.
Cleveland, OH 44115

EXAMINER


GREEN, BRIAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3611

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/026,041	Applicant(s) DARIF ET AL.	
	Examiner Brian K. Green	Art Unit 3611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 25 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 25, 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 1-9 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 1, line 2, "is-coated" should apparently be "is coated". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 8 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 and 25 are indefinite since the second surface is not coated with the first colored coating composition rather it is coated with a second colored coating composition that is the same as the first colored coating composition.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 1, lines 10-27 and page 2, lines 10-14 in view of Teter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,112,665).

The applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 2, lines 10-14 discloses the idea of covering a color card with a single color. The applicant's admitted prior art in the specification

Art Unit: 3611

page 2, lines 10-14 does not disclose the idea of placing perforations in the card to form a detachable paint chip section. Teter et al. shows in figures 4 and 5 the idea of placing perforations (14) within a colored section in order to allow the perforated area to be removed. In view of the teachings of Teter et al. it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify the applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 2, lines 10-14 by adding perforations to the color card to form a detachable chip section since this would allow an opening to be formed within the color coated card which would allow better color matching to be performed, as taught by Teter et al., column 4, lines 55-65. In regard to claim 2, when the perforated section is removed from the card a window would be created. In regard to claims 3 and 13, applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 1, lines 10-27 and page 2, lines 10-14 discloses the idea of making the card including a plurality of colors thereon rectangular but does not disclose the particular shape of the card that is completely covered with a single color. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the color card square since the applicant fails to provide any advantage to making the card square and the rectangular card taught by applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 1, lines 10-27 would work equally well. Further, it is considered within one skilled in the art to make the color card any shape as desired. In regard to claims 4 and 14, applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 1, lines 10-27 discloses the idea of making the color card from paper. In regard to claim 11, the perforated section, could be separated along three sides and folded along the fourth side as defined.

Claims 5-7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 1, lines 10-27 and page 2, lines 10-14 in view of

Art Unit: 3611

Teter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,112,665) as applied to claims 1 and 10 above and further in view of Day et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,104,809)

Applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 1, lines 10-27 and page 2, lines 10-14 does not disclose placing a formula for the paint color. Day et al. shows in figure 1 the idea of placing indicia for indicating the color of each chip section and indicia for indicating a code/formula for each chip section. In view of the teachings of Day et al. it would have been obvious to one in the art to place the paint formula/code on each of the paint chip sections since this would allow a person to make the desired colored paint in an easier and faster manner. In regard to claim 7, as broadly defined, the indicia printed on the first surface as taught by Day et al. would be "over" the second surface (back surface) of the paint color card, i.e. the indicia would be "above" the second surface when the first surface is being viewed from above which is one of the conventional ways in which the card would be viewed.

Claims 8 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 1, lines 10-27 and page 2, lines 10-14 in view of Teter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,112,665) as applied to claims 1 and 10 above and further in view of Edwards (U.S. Patent No. 4,992,050) or Goldsholl (U.S. Patent No. 3,224,113).

The applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 1, lines 10-27 and page 2, lines 10-14 in view of Teter et al. disclose the applicant's basic inventive concept except for placing a color coating on the back of each paint card that is the same as the first color coating composition. Edwards discloses in the abstract the idea of placing a first color of paint on a first

Art Unit: 3611

side of a chip section and a coating of paint on the opposite side of each chip section that is the same color. Edwards discloses that the paint on the second side has a different finish as compared to the first side. Goldsholl discloses in column 1, lines 59-62, the idea of placing paint on the front and back surfaces of a paint card. In view of the teachings of Edwards or Goldsholl it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 1, lines 10-27 and page 2, lines 10-14 by placing a coat of paint on the second surface of each chip section since this would allow the color of the paint to be seen on either side of the chip section, i.e. easier and quicker to determine the paint color shown by the color card. While Edwards and Goldsholl do not specifically disclose making the coating compositions on the first and second surfaces the same, they do teach the idea of placing coating compositions on the first and second surfaces of the color card. It is considered within one skilled in the art to make the coating compositions the same to achieve the advantage of determining the paint color in an easier and quicker manner. Further, it is considered within one skilled in the art to place any coating composition on the second surface as desired. Further, the applicant fails to define any advantage to placing the same composition on the second surface as on the first surface.

Claims 9 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 1, lines 10-27 and page 2, lines 10-14 in view of Teter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,112,665) as applied to claims 1 and 10 above and further in view of Goldsholl (U.S. Patent No. 3,224,113).

The applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 1, lines 10-27 and page 2, lines 10-14 in view of Teter et al. disclose the applicant's basic inventive concept except for placing a

Art Unit: 3611

color coating on the back of each paint card that has a different color than the first color coating composition. Goldsholl discloses in column 1, lines 59-62 and column 2, lines 40-50, the idea of placing paint on the front and back surfaces of a paint card. Goldsholl suggests in these lines that the colors on the front are different from the colors on the front of the card. In view of the teachings of Goldsholl it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify applicant's admitted prior art in the specification page 1, lines 10-27 and page 2, lines 10-14 by placing a coat of paint on the second surface of each chip section that is different in color than the first composition on the first surface since this would allow more colors to be displayed by the color card, i.e. this would allow more colors to be shown by a single paint card.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed Sept. 8, 2004 have been fully considered but most of the arguments are moot in view of the new rejection.

The applicant argues that since the objection made by the examiner in claim 1, line 2 is directed to a marking to show changes made, and are not part of the claim as written, it is believed that no correction is necessary. The examiner disagrees since the marking appears to be a part of the claim and should be corrected accordingly.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K. Green whose telephone number is (703) 308-1011. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-3:30pm.

Art Unit: 3611

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on (703) 308-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


BRIAN K. GREEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Bkg
Nov. 24, 2004